

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended herein. Favorable reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

I. CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Claims 1 and 8 have been amended to emphasize a feature of the invention whereby there is no need for a dedicated or predefined remote control to carry out a remote control function. As recited in amended claims 1 and 8, the present invention provides for registering the remote code and a selected operation of a program in a registration table, regardless of whether the register or computer has previous knowledge of the remote code. For reasons explained more fully below, the cited art does not teach or suggest such features.

Support for such amendment is found, for example, at page 1, lines 16-19; and page 4, lines 17-18 and 24-26, of the specification. No new matter has been added.

Additionally, claim 8 has been amended in response to a non-statutory subject matter rejection.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 8-14 UNDER 35 USC §101

Claims 8-14 stand rejected under 35 USC §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection for at least the following reasons.

The Examiner indicates that a computer program product is non-statutory if it is unclear whether the computer program product is stored on a computer readable

media. In response, applicants have amended independent claim 8 to make it clear that the computer program product is stored on a computer readable media.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 8-14 are directed to statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-5 AND 8-12 UNDER 35 USC §102(b)

Claims 1-5 and 8-12 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) based on *Cha*. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants invention is directed to a remote control system and method which allows a user to utilize virtually any remote controller to control the operation of the execution of a program. The present application describes how the system receives a remote control signal, decodes the signal, and determines whether or not the decoded signal has already been registered. If not, the system allows the decoded signal to be registered together with a corresponding operation as explained, for example, in connection with FIG. 2 of the present application.

Accordingly, a user may utilize virtually any remote controller to control the system. The system does not require that a known dedicated or predefined remote controller be utilized for reasons that the system is not expecting to receive only a predefined set of remote control commands. (See, e.g., Spec, p. 1, Ins. 16-19; p. 4, Ins. 17-18 and 24-26).

Cha is directed to a system with user programmable buttons. Although somewhat difficult to understand, *Cha* clearly does not describe a system like that in the present invention.

Specifically, *Cha* describes a system in which a user may associate different operations with specified buttons (thus rendering the buttons programmable). For

example, FIG. 6 of *Cha* illustrates how the system may include eight different buttons which may be associated with eight different respective programs. By dragging and dropping, etc., different programs can be associated with the different buttons. When a user then goes to utilize the buttons, the user may either point and click using a mouse together with a mini menu shown on the display as represented in FIG. 5, for example; the user may press a corresponding physical button on the face of the computer such as shown in FIG. 4, element 712; or the user may press a button on a remote control (not shown), the button corresponding to a respective one of the eight buttons otherwise included on the button panel 712 or the mini menu on the display as shown in FIG. 5.

As a result, *Cha* teaches generating a table as represented in FIG. 7 which includes a respective remote code together with a corresponding program operation. Presumably, although it is not clear, the remote control can be used to select a corresponding one of the eight buttons during the programming stage by which respective buttons are associated with respective operation. (See, e.g., Col. 5, Ins. 13-24; and Col. 6, Ins. 12-25 and 39-46).

Significantly, however, *Cha* requires that the particular codes received from the remote control in association with the selected eight buttons be predetermined. In other words, *Cha* requires that the system receive only expected or predefined remote control codes with respect to use in connection with the eight programmable buttons. (See, e.g., Col. 5, Ins. 12-20, referring to when a predetermined remote control signal is inputted (emphasis added)).

Thus, *Cha requires a dedicated or predetermined remote control*, which is precisely what the present invention seeks to avoid. Amended claims 1 and 8, on the other hand, emphasize that the remote code and a selected operation of a program are registered in a registration table, regardless of whether the register or computer has previous knowledge of the remote code. In such manner, the present invention allows virtually any remote control code to be received and registered with a selected

operation independent of whether such remote control code was previously known to the system. In this manner, virtually any remote controller can be used with the present invention.

Cha simply does not teach or suggest a system that registers a remote code regardless of whether the register/computer has previous knowledge of the remote code as recited in amended claims 1 and 8. *Cha* teaches that the remote control must provide a predetermined signal such that the microprocessor understands the particular operation to undertake in response to such signal. Thus, *Cha* is restricted to a known, dedicated remote control for the reasons stated above.

For at least the above reasons, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-5 and 8-12.

IV. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 2, 4-7, 9 AND 11-14 UNDER 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 2, 4-7, 9 and 11-14 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on *Cha* in view of *Wugoski*. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 2, 4-7, 9 and 11-14 each depend from claim 1 or claim 8, either directly or indirectly. As a result, these claims may be distinguished over *Cha* for at least the same reasons discussed above. Moreover, *Wugoski* does not make up for the above-discussed deficiencies in *Cha*.

V. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, all claims 1-14 are believed to be allowable and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

Application No.: 10/799,993

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Should a petition for an extension of time be necessary for the timely reply to the outstanding Office Action (or if such a petition has been made and an additional extension is necessary), petition is hereby made and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees (including additional claim fees) to Deposit Account No. 18-0988.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

/Mark D. Saralino/
Mark D. Saralino
Reg. No. 34,243

DATE: June 14, 2006

The Keith Building
1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113
intlp100amendmentafternonfinal.wpd